



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/843,152	04/27/2001	Osamu Sameshima	43890-513	7309
7590	11/29/2005		EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			SAJOUS, WESNER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/843,152	SAMESHIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wesner Sajous	2676	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-13 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remark

This communication is responsive to the amendment and response filed on 9/12/2005. Claims 1-3, and 5-12 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuppy et al. (US 6733295) in view of Monroe et al. (US 2002/0097322).

Considering claims 1 and 2, Stuppy discloses a wireless display system (see figs. 1-3) comprises plural personal computers (e.g., item 2-5 of fig. 1) having wireless communication function (via server 10, see col. 6, lines 34-39); and a wireless display (1, fig. 1) having wireless communication function and a display function (e.g., teacher display, see fig. 2), wherein screens of some of the plurality of personal computers are displayed simultaneously in the display unit of the wireless display (see fig. 2, wherein

the teacher display is shown to represent the displays of students 1-3 on the teacher's screen), wherein the wireless display (1) further has an input function, and the plural personal computers (e.g., the student's computers) are operated through wireless communication by using the input function of the wireless display, and wherein display data with respect to an operation data created by a pointing device of the wireless display is displayed on a screen of at least one of the plural personal computers. See col. 4, lines 35-38, and col. 5, lines 3-56.

Although Stuppy discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, Stuppy fails to show the screens are displayed simultaneously by dividing the display unit of the wireless display.

Monroe, in a similar art, teaches the functional equivalence for simultaneously displays a plurality of screens on a display unit (e.g., display signals or videos of multiple different cameras on a single screen. See paragraphs 79, 97 of pages 6 and 7). In addition, Monroe at fig. 6 discloses the simultaneous display of a plurality of screens (104A to 104D) on a display unit (100) by dividing the display unit of the wireless display (see paragraph 97). Further, Monroe discloses the wireless display (*i.e., the primary monitor*) has an input function (*i.e., a double left and right click or a drag/drop operation and/or a point-click-and-drag feature using mouse pointer*) to operate the plural computers (e.g., to select, display and control any of the secondary monitors). See paragraphs 21-22, and 24-26. This implies that the plural personal computers (or the secondary screens or cameras) are operated by using the input function of the wireless display (or primary display). It is to be noted that the cameras

signals can be transmitted to the display via wireless communication (see paragraph 61), wherein the each of the video camera signals is characterized herein as an independent screen, which can be associated with PC monitor screen, as implied at paragraph 81 in page 6.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to modify the wireless communication and students/teacher interaction disclosed in Stuppy to include multiple divided screens displayed on a single display unit with input that operates the plural monitors via wireless communication as taught in the same conventional manner by Monroe, in order to permit conservation of bandwidth requirement and allow a user to monitor more than one screen simultaneously. See Monroe's paragraphs 44 and 57-58.

Re claim 3, it is noted that since the user of the main display in Monroe is able to switch over to view of a selected camera display as he/she desires (paragraphs 94 and 97), a specific code or indication must be provided via the user input device in order for the main display to recognize and display the desired screen's signal. Hence, Monroe teaches the features of claim 3. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claims 6 and 8, it is noted that since in Stuppy, it is provided that the teacher's display has a pen-based tablet input (see col. 4, lines 32-33), it is obvious that the teacher display encompasses a touch panel with a display function, as claimed, on which the teacher may interact with desired student's computer by touching the touch panel.

Re claim 7, the claimed "common operation screen... in the plural personal computers" is met by Stuppy's col. 5, lines 3-35.

Re claims 9-10, It is noted that since in Monroe an icon is used to confirm the selection of a specific camera screen, and upon the user selection a screen camera is tied to a highlighted camera to identify the specific event caused by the camera (see paragraph 101 of page 8); thus, the wireless display of Monroe provides the functional equivalence for outputting an indicator, which includes changing the color of the corresponding screen of the display unit, in response to an occurrence at a personal computer as claimed. Wherein the highlighting and display functions correspond to the changes of color and the icon is characterized as the indicator. Therefore, Monroe when combined with the Stuppy reference meets the limitations of claims 9 and 10. See claim 1 for reason of obviousness.

Re claim 11, the claimed "occurrence includes a specified key being entered..." is met by Stuppy's col. 5, lines 3-14.

Re claim 12, the claimed "display includes a processing unit for converting data received from a personal computer into information identifying the personal computer" is equivalently met by item 12 of fig. 3 in Stuppy. Note that it is industry standard for personal computers to include processing unit to convert and process information for display, either locally or remotely.

Re claim 13, Stuppy discloses inputted data is displayed in the display unit of the wireless display. See col. 5, lines 10-14.

Art Unit: 2676

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuppy in view of Monroe, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Panasik (US Pat. 6219553).

Re claim 5, Want discloses most claimed features of the invention, but Wang fails to teach that the plurality of computers, which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves.

Panasik teaches the plurality of computers, which are wireless, are capable to communicate between themselves (see col. 3, lines 44-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Stuppy reference to include the features of Panasik, in order allow easy interaction between each of the students of the computer users.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2676


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajous Wesner whose telephone number is 571-272-7791. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays thru Fridays between 11:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Bella can be reached on 571-272-7778. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wesner Sajous -WS-


November 18, 2005



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600